## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## **CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	CV 12-9749-JAK (SP)			Date	January 8, 2013	
Title	ALVIN JONES v. Michael J. Astrue					
Present: The Honorable Sheri Pym, United States Magistrate Judge						
Kimberly I. Carter			None	None		
Deputy Clerk			Court Reporter / Recorder		Tape No.	
Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:			iff: Attorneys	Attorneys Present for Defendant:		
None Present			N	None Present		
Proceedings: (In Chambers) Order to Show Cause Why Plaintiff Alvin Jones Should Not Be Dismissed for Failure to Effect Service						

On November 20, 2012, plaintiff filed a Complaint for Review of Final Decision of the Commissioner of Social Security pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). On November 26, 2012, the court issued its Case Management Order in this matter. In that order, the court advised plaintiff that the summons and complaint must be served on defendant in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(i), and specifically ordered that a proof of such service must be filed with the court within 28 days after the filing of the complaint, i.e., on or before December 18, 2012. The court warned plaintiff that failure to comply with this requirement may result in the dismissal of this case.

To date, the court has not received a proof of service. Nor has plaintiff requested or obtained an order from the court granting an extension of time to do so. It therefore appears that plaintiff has violated the court's order and is not properly prosecuting this action.

Accordingly, plaintiff is ORDERED to show cause in writing by *January 23*, 2013 why this case should not be dismissed without prejudice for plaintiff's failure to prosecute and serve defendant within the required time period, as directed in the Case Management Order. Plaintiff may discharge this Order to Show Cause by filing, not later than January 23, 2013, proof of service of the summons and complaint.

The court warns plaintiff that failure to respond to this Order to Show Cause by January 23, 2013, or further failure to prosecute this action in accordance with the Case Management Order and other court orders, may result in dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute.